

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/171,854	10/22/1998	STEFAN JOOS	3528.38.USOO	8548	
7:	590 03/12/2002				
ALBERT P HALLUIN			EXAMINER		
HOWREY & SIMON 1299 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE NW			SISSON, BRADLEY L		
BOX NO 34 WASHINGTON, DC 200042402			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
WASHINGTO	N, DC 200042402		1634	2	
			DATE MAILED: 03/12/2002	2	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)					
Advisory Action	09/171,854	JOOS ET AL.					
Advisory Addon	Examiner	Art Unit					
	Bradley L. Sisson	1634					
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence addi	ress				
THE REPLY FILED 21 February 2002 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.							
-	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		1				
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on <u>09 November 2001</u> . Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.							
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered b							
(a) they raise new issues that would require furth		see NOTE below);					
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note I			ne 1 11				
(c) they are not deemed to place the application i issues for appeal; and/or							
(d) they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.							
NOTE:							
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):							
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).							
5.⊠ The a)☐ affidavit, b)☐ exhibit, or c)⊠ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: <u>See interview summary</u> .							
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.							
7.⊠ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a)⊠ will not be entered or b)☐ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.							
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:							
Claim(s) allowed:							
Claim(s) objected to:							
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-8</u> .							
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:							
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is a) approved or b) disapproved by the Examiner.							
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)							
10.⊠ Other: Interview summary							
		<u> </u>					
		Bradley L. Sisson Primary Examiner					

interview Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Bradley L. Sisson	1634	
All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTC	personnel):		
(1) Bradley L. Sisson.	(3)		
(2) <u>Viola T. Kung, Reg. No. 41,131</u> .	(4)		
Date of Interview: <u>11 March 2002</u> .			
Type: a)⊠ Telephonic b)□ Video Conference c)□ Personal [copy given to: 1)□ applicant	2) applicant's representat	ive]	
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes If Yes, brief description:	e) No.		
Claim(s) discussed: <u>1</u> .			
Identification of prior art discussed:			
Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached	. g)⊠ was not reached. h)□ N/A.	
Substance of Interview including description of the general reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amerallowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached; i) It is not necessary for applicant to provide a checked). Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FOMUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIET action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ON STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIET reverse side or on attached sheet.	et . Indoments which the examiner a copy of the amendments that ed.) Indoments which the examiner are copy of the amendments that ed.) Indoments which the substated are considered as a constant of the substated are considered as a constant of the substated are constant of the substate	agreed would renot would renot to would render the nce of the intervience of the intervience of the LAST OFFI (14). If a reply to the RVIEW DATE TO	der the claims e claims ew(if box is CE ACTION he last Office O FILE A
Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.	Examiner's s	ignature, if require	ed

Application No.

09/171,854

Applicant(s)
JOOS ET AL.



Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews

Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case unless both applicant and examiner agree that the examiner will record same. Where the examiner agrees to record the substance of the interview, or when it is adequately recorded on the Form or in an attachment to the Form, the examiner should check the appropriate box at the bottom of the Form which informs the applicant that the submission of a separate record of the substance of the interview as a supplement to the Form is not required.

It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner,
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,
 - (The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.

Continuation Sheet (PTO-413)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Mr. Sisson contacted Ms. Kung so to discuss the rule 1.116 response of 21 February 2002. Mr. Sisson expressed concern over the aspect of the claimed method not necessarily resulting in the intended result. Attention was directed to the aspect of step (a) resulting in a excess of amplification product that ahs a first label, and that this amplification product is hybridized to test cells and them seemingly amplified with the same set of primers used in step (a), yet being labeled with a different label. Mr. Sisson indicated that if the second amplification step is performed with the hybridized cells of (b), and that the same primers are utilized, then seemingly one would be generating equal amounts of amplification product that is resulting from the amplification product of (a) as well as from the DNA of cells under study. Mr. Sisson that while one would generate a mixture of amplification product having two different labels, the only target to which they are hybridizing is that of cells that do not have any changes in number, yet it is from this hybridization step that one is to now somehow deduce the copy number chromosomes in the test cells. Ms. Kung indicated that she recognized the issue and that she would discuss this matter further with the examiner once she has obtained the recognized for the processor of a purple tide sequence that

Mr. Sisson also directed attention to page 5, lines 10-11, as containing a representation of a nucleotide sequence that is covered by the Sequence Rules and as such, needs to be accompanied with a SEQ ID NO., and that a Sequence Listing needs to be provided. Ms. Kung indicated tht this can be corrected by a subsequent communication.